DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 247 SP 008 610

TITLE	Journal of Proceedings [Annual Convention of the National Association of State Boards of Education, October 6-9, 1974].
INSTITUTION	National Association of State Boards of Education, Denver, Colo.
PUB DATE	Oct 74
NOTE	56p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports; Education; Educational Policy; Educational Trends; *Professional Associations; *State Boards of Education

ABSTRACT

This document presents the minutes of the 1974 Proceedings of the National Association of State Boards of Education, the budget proposed at the proceedings, and summaries of papers presented. Summaries are given of the following papers: (a) The Challenge of Educational Leadership: State Boards and Results Oriented Management; (b) Sex Bias Legislation in Education, the Future of Federal Support for Education, and Influencing Educational Legislation in Congress; (c) The Constitution, the States, and Education: Recent Developments; (d) State Boards Examined and Found Wanting; and (e) Race and Higher Education in America. (JA)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED 098247

NASBE

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Journal of Proceedings

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP008 610

1974
CONVENTION
NEW YORK CITY
OCTOBER 6-9

ORDER OF CONTENTS

Convention Registrants

Summaries of Speeches

- Dr. Terrel H. Bell
- The Honorable Shirley Chisholm
- The Honorable Peter A. Peyser
- A Dialogue Three Issues
- Mr. J. Harold Flannery
- Dr. Tim L. Mazzoni, Jr.
- Dr. Virginia Y. Trotter
- Dr. Kenneth B. Clark
- Appendix A - Mini-Conference Evaluation
- Appendix B - Convention Evaluation

Minutes of Annual Business Meeting

Courtesy Resolution

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
Annual Convention - October 6-9, 1974
New York, New York

REGISTRANTS

Alabama

Cherry, Annie Lee (S.A.)
Higginbotham, Ralph
Thomasson, Isabelle (Alfred P.)

Alaska

Horn, Beverly (Louie J.)
Hurley, Katherine T.)

American Samoa

Solomona, Rev. Siulagi
Urhle, Mrs. Jane P.

Arizona

Jenkins, Stephen S., Jr.
Picone, J. Ben

California

Heydt, Henry J., Jr.
Ingoglia, Patricia D.
Krotz, Virla R.

Colorado

Apker, Wesley (Carol)
Frazier, Calvin M.
Hensley, Gene
Johnston, Robin
Lamb, Allan B. (Lillian)
Smith, Ronald L. (Luanne)
Wagoner, Maria P.

Connecticut

DeCourcy, Dayson D.
Smith, Catherine V.A.

Delaware

Grossman, Elise
Madden, Kenneth C.
McBride, Robert H. (Norma)

Georgia

Huseman, Carolyn
Rice, David F.
Smith, Mrs. A. Edward

Guam

Camacho, Edward G. (Irene)
San Nicolas, Jose T.
Tenorio, Juan C. (Charlene)

Hawaii

Tsubaki, Kiyoto (Hamako)

Idaho

Seppi, Leno D. (Joyce)

Illinois

Long, Charles M.

Indiana

Stone, John B. (Mabel)

Iowa

Davidson, Jolly Ann (Richard)
Heronimus, T.J. (Marcia)
Shepard, Muriel I.
Sievers, Georgia A. (Earl G.)
VanDerLinden, John (Marjorie)

Kansas

Ballard, Dorothy
Billingsley, Will (Meryl)
Wilson, Karl M. (Alice)

Kentucky

Asher, David C. (spouse)
Brown, Rev. Bob W. (Helen)

Louisiana

Bankston, Jesse H. (Ruth)
Bopp, Edward S. (Pat)
Ingram, Earl (Mimi)
Roy, A.J. (spouse)

Maine

Dibner, Martin
Nathanson, Mrs. Tobie (Jon)

Maryland

Frampton, Jerome, Jr.
Goldsborough, William N. (spouse)
Hendrick, Joseph L.
Moyer, Ellen
Sensenbaugh, James A. (Alice)
Spigler, Fred H., Jr.

Massachusetts

Bond, John W.
Corriveau, Ramona L.
Kipp, Mrs. Rae Cecilia

Michigan

Miller, Mrs. Annetta (Sidney)
Sederburg, William A.

Minnesota

Bye, Richard L. (Janet)
Brandon, David C., Jr. (Janet)
Burton, Daniel F.
Casmey, Howard B.
Chelgren, Dorothea M.
Gasterland, Lorin (Swen)
Smerling, Louis R. (Beverly)
Richardson, Mary Jo

Missouri

Flippen, EllaMae
Griffith, Eleanor B.

Montana

Bennett, Richard C. (Joan)
Colburg, Dolores
Hutchinson, Cheryl S.
King, Marjorie W. (Joe)

Nebraska

Creigh, Dorothy Weyer
Landis, Frank E. (spouse)
Waldo, Willard

Nevada

Clarke, Rosemary
Cunningham, Cynthia
Franzinelli, Rev. Benjamin
(mother, Ms. Edith)

New Hampshire

Bittenbender, William (Virginia)
Borchers, Donald E.

New Jersey

Epstein, Marion G.
Hurd, Calvin J.
Schabacher, William

New Mexico

Romero, Joe

New York

Black, Theodore M. (Barbara)
Bloom, Arnold
Griffith, Emlyn (Mary)
Klein, Genevieve S.
Manning, Rick
McGovern, Joseph W. (Marie)
Newcomb, Harold E. (Betty)
Pforzheimer, Carl H. (Carol K.)
Power, Helen B. (Kenneth)
Pryor, Keith

North Carolina

Manz, Richard R. (Peggy)

North Dakota

Hilborn, Richard L. (Evelyn)

Ohio

Agler, Martha B. (L. Dewitt)
Essex, Martin W.
George, Susan D.
Lyons, Robert A. (Wenona)
Meckstroth, John R. (Elaine)
Shaffer, Wayne E.
Wise, Martha (Wayne C., Jr.)

Oregon

Maxwell, W. Warren (Bea)

Pennsylvania

Evans, Russell C.
Freedman, Jane S.
Hershey, John O. (Lucille)
Hottel, Dr. Althea K.
Rowland, James H., Sr. (Clara)
Speaker, Fred

Puerto Rico

Bothwell, Reece B.

Rhode Island

O'Neil, Christopher

South Carolina

Blake, James A. (spouse)
Connor, James M. (Lynn)
Stoudemire, E.B. (Violet)
Stukes, S. Guerry (spouse)
Taylor, Elizabeth (Earle)

South Dakota

Anderson, Ben A. (Iyone)
Bergen, Evelyn
Koehn, Emil A. (Doris)
Koupal, Dan J. (Pat)
Olson, Judith R.
Golden, Ruth
Steven, Lillehaugh

Tennessee

Carmichael, Benjamin E.
Dennis, Stephen
Hawkins, James W. (Betty)
Jennings, Edward L.
Stevens, Mrs. Callie Lentz

Texas

Kemp, Dr. William
Wells, Jane H.

Utah

Anderson, Jesse (Eona)
Garrett, Stephen L.
Landa, Esther R.
Owen, John L.
Wright, W. Robert

Vermont

Hunt, Pat
Illuzzi, Vincent

Virginia

Caruthers, Preston C. (Jeanne)
Helm, Elizabeth G.

Virgin Islands

Anduze, Dr. Aubrey A. (spouse)
Hassell, Esonia M. (Louis)
Lee, Sidney
Scarbriel, Rudolph
Thomas, Joan A.
Watlington, Mario
Williams, Patrick N.

Washington

Anderson, Grant L. (Diane)
Barnes, Orville L. (Marge)
Diamond, Edward (Arlene)

Washington, D.C.

Exton, Elaine
Hansford, Byron W. (Sue)
Lewis, Anne
Reed, Dr. Wayne O.

West Virginia

Bartram, Anagene P.
Geary, James P. (Mary Jane)
Ross, Perce J. (Ruth)
Snoderley, E.L. (Twila)
Taylor, Daniel B. (Rosemary)

Wisconsin

Dimick, Donald E. (Maxine)

Wyoming

Hunter, Edward W. (Maxine)
McNeil, Harriet G.
Simons, Lynn

SPEAKERS

Dr. Terrel H. Bell	-	Washington, D.C.
Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm	-	New York
Congressman Peter A. Peyser	-	New York
David Selden	-	Washington, D.C.
Dr. Alvin P. Lierheimer	-	New York
Dr. Paul Salmon	-	Virginia
J. Harold Flannery	-	Washington, D.C.
Dr. Tim L. Mazzoni, Jr.	-	Minnesota
Dr. Virginia Y. Trotter	-	Washington, D.C.
Dr. Kenneth B. Clark	-	New York

SUMMARIES OF SPEECHES

THE CHALLENGE OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP: State Boards and Results Oriented Management

by

T. H. Bell
U. S. Commissioner of Education

I would like first of all to express my appreciation for your invitation to deliver this convention's opening address. My sense of the strategic importance of leadership by State boards of education, and my longstanding concern with the problems of education leadership in our country, make this opportunity a particularly gratifying one for me.

There are a number of extremely critical areas where the States have been negligent. I can't miss an opportunity such as this to tell you of these shortcomings -- as I perceive them to be -- and to urge you to become aggressive advocates for change.

I am convinced that State boards of education must take a tough, utterly unequivocal position on some of the gross inequities that we have let stand for so long. I believe you must be more than advocates for improvements in education. I believe you must be activists.

The five most critical problems and performance gaps upon which your activism should focus are these:

1. School finance equity
2. School district organization and boundaries
3. Collective bargaining in education
4. Education of handicapped children
5. Performance accountability in education

School finance equity stands as a problem we all recognize. We agree that the differences in local property tax revenues available per student from one school district to another represents the most blatant injustice. But it's like the weather. We all talk about school finance inequities, but no one seems willing to do much about it.

No State board of education should tolerate the injustice foisted upon school children through an inadequate or non-existent school finance formula. So I urge you, in the strongest and most compelling language that I can use -- Please take up this challenge.

Please stand tall and tough and speak to your legislators and governors in an increasingly loud voice on this matter.

Until every one of the 50 State education systems builds its house on the solid foundation of a modern school finance formula, much of whatever else we do will slip and slide for lack of this firm and lasting support.

We have been searching for equity and fairness and for equality of opportunity though the sixties and thus far in the seventies. But this great equity movement will not see its full fruition until the State legislatures enact school finance laws that are fair and just and cognizant of the varied needs of our people.

School district organization and boundaries represent the second problem area requiring the attention of State boards of education.

We have far too many school districts in the United States. Many small, administratively weak and costly school systems should be reorganized and consolidated into larger, more efficient units. On the other hand, we have same monstrously large school systems that should be broken down into units of more reasonable size.

Many of our school district boundaries don't make any sense. They have stood too long. They need the attention of active and courageous State Boards.

The wrath of those who oppose these necessary changes must be matched by your righteous wrath that tells you that you can no longer neglect your duty as a State board member with an obligation to stand up for progress and for sound educational practice.

It's time to consolidate the small districts and change the boundaries in our great metropolitan areas. It's time to set up our school systems to face the future. This isn't easy. You know you will be attacked and will be the center of a big brawl. But the time is ripe, and you and your State board colleagues will feel, deep down inside, that you are doing what ought to be done.

#I turn now to the third problem area: Collective Bargaining in Education.

Teacher and school employee organization for bargaining purposes is here to stay. Teacher militancy has emerged in its present form over the past few years, and collective bargaining in education is fast becoming a fact of life in many States. Some very long, inexcusably long, school shutdowns have occurred because of poor State supervision and assistance. We need fair and equitable State laws that protect students from undue disruption in the teaching-learning process.

Education of handicapped children is my fourth item of concern in today's world of education.

It is hard to believe that more than three million handicapped children are not being served by education in our country. Many parents of the handicapped have gone to court to compel recognition of the education needs of their children. State policy should respond to these needs without court action.

The fifth and last item on my list of performance gaps is a bit more difficult to describe and define than the others. It has to do with our standards, our measurements, our discipline, and our vigor in education.

I believe firmly that when performance is measured, performance improves. I believe, moreover, that when performance is measured, and the results are reported back, the rate of improvement accelerates

If we are to have a well managed system of education we must have standards by which we measure and determine our progress.

State boards of education should not hesitate to lay down the law on performance accountability as long as they do it in a positive, reasonable, and uplifting way.

Conclusion

The leadership responsibilities of State boards of education lead you inevitably into positions of controversy.

I urge you to take a long look at your present powers and perquisites, with a view to extending them. You just may have happened along at the right time, and legally armed, may fulfill a whole new order of actions along with the old. In educational history, the State board's time has come. You should leave no leadership prerogatives or any power vacuum for others to fill.

It is aptly said that the State legislature is actually the chief policy making body for American education. But you influence that policy while it is being made and lead in implementing it afterward. You must be a very strong force in seeking legislation.

State boards of education, as I see it, will have to be willing to face controversy, accept heated criticism, and hold for what is right when it is not popular to do so. But you can be the most powerful group in education if you will unite behind a few of the large longstanding issues.

As all of us have learned by now, being a part of the establishment isn't so bad once you get used to it. If the truth were told, it's really rather nice belonging.

Are you too much a part of the so-called establishment to be aggressive advocates of change? I hope not, and I think not. At least, in talking to the leaders of NASBE, I gained the impression

that the time is ripe and that many of you are, in fact, ahead of me on these issues and on others that I did not mention because I was attempting to be conservative in what I recommended.

I close by expressing my high hopes for NASBE as a national organization. You have a fine, bright, able and youthful new executive secretary. Your officers are unusually able and dedicated. I see great things ahead for this organization.

* * * * * *

Sex Bias Legislation in Education, The Future of Federal Support for Education, and Influencing Educational Legislation in Congress

by

The Honorable Shirley Chisholm, Congresswoman,
Twelfth Congressional District, New York

The Honorable Peter A. Peyser, Congressman,
Twenty-third Congressional District, New York

Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm's speech centered around the fact that the Federal government must significantly increase the amount of support for education in this country. She pointed out that 8% of Federal budget goes to education while 27% goes to defense. She stated that this is a "national disgrace." She further emphasized that as this country is approaching its 200th birthday, the country must assure every child an opportunity for an education. She stated that she listened to Dr. Bell when he emphasized that the states must meet the responsibility for improving the education; she feels the Federal government should meet this need also. She feels that the Federal contribution to education must move from 7% to 15%. Areas which she felt must be strengthened are as follows: 1. compensatory education, 2. education for handicapped children, and 3. bilingual education. She concluded by saying that "change is the nature of things in this country."

The main ideas presented in Congressman Peter Peyser's speech were 1. the wastes in Federal spending and 2. the actions which NASBE members and other citizens can take to change policies in this country. Elaborating further he declared that 30 and 40 year old programs of agricultural subsidy are in existence. In a program which is intended to provide food for the underpriviledged countries of the world, he found that the U.S. was sending tobacco to Viet Nam and other Eastern countries. Peyser then said, "This is providing food?" The peanut subsidy next came under Peyser's scrutiny when

he related that 500 million in tax dollars are being spent for a peanut subsidy in this country. He also indicated that in his judgement there is too much wasteful spending in the military and in foreign aid. He felt that by cutting down on wasteful areas, more money could be provided for much needed education programs.

Concerning what State boards can do nationally, Peyser felt that they can have a direct impact on Congress. He stated, "NASBE must come out swinging." Individually written letters can be one of the prime moving influences.

He also encouraged the members to take time to get involved and to motivate other people to become involved.

* * * * * * *

A Dialogue on Three Issues

Issue I - Performance-Based Teacher Education: Overexposed and Underdeveloped

by

Alvin P. Lierheimer
Associate Commissioner for Higher Education
The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department

The picture one gets of performance-based teacher education is of a system which is overexposed and underdeveloped. The detail whichwe have promised by the phrase "competency-based teacher education" is simply not yet developed although we may well have overexposed our subject.

For decades teachers could become licensed to serve in the public schools only by completing a prescribed sequence of college courses.

The 1950's and 60's saw growing discontent on the part of the public with the accomplishments of the schools. People began to focus on performance and production. By the end of the 1960's there was also a significant influx into the field of education of persons from disciplines related to the field of education in new ways. Education was a big business; it received large-scale federal support and a vigorous new segment of academe became interested in the preparation of teachers as well as in curriculum, administration and other learning-related fields.

Performance-based teacher education arrived on the scene at the same time that there was a marked change in the economic condition of the schools.

Performance-based teacher education strode on the scene at a time marked by increasingly militant unionism which gave political muscle to the schoolmarm.

Simultaneously a growing sense of consumerism developed on the part of the public: they demanded accountability.

One final element in this social setting was an increasing fascination with innovation for its own sake. Especially in the field of education, all sorts of new wrinkles were touted as panaceas.

Now a snapshot of performance-based teacher education at this moment in time,a look at the areas of most criticism.

We have heard that the Statewide Plan imposes a single, mechanistic system of teacher education. No, the Plan simply says that the State expects programs of preparation to (a) state the skills, knowledge and attitudes expected of graduates, (b) tell what evidence will be accepted to show that these expectations are being met, and (c) tell what evidence will be acceptable to show that these expectations are appropriate for the schools themselves.

Performance-based teacher education is criticized as anti-intellectual because there is no theoretical base for it. The performance-based teacher education system asks for a definition of the role and responsibility of the teaching position and asks that such a definition be used as a foundation for the skills, knowledge and attitudes developed.

One of the strongest criticisms has come in the matter of required collaboration among various parties involved in the preparation of teachers. The purpose of collaborative development of teacher education is to gain assurance for the public that there is currency and realism in the preparation of professional personnel that interweaves theory, academic content, and professional classroom practice.

There is lack of agreement on what teachers must be able to do at a given grade level or in a given subject field. There is also lack of agreement how it can best be determined whether or not they are able to perform at a satisfactory level and how they can best be taught the most effective ways of serving in the classroom.

Our great expectations for reform of teacher education in New York State should probably have been more modestly phrased as "plans for marked improvement." Perhaps in our enthusiasm we have raised expectations beyond a realistic point. We will continue our emphasis in New York State on the development and refinement of programs which (1) analyze the needs of the school professional, (2) design programs specifically addressed to preparing professionals to fill those needs, and (3) monitor the success of graduates in demonstrating the knowledge, skills, and attitudes established for the program.

Reaction to Lierheimer's Presentation

Mr. Selden: In the past teachers were expected to take orders from the administrators and the board; that was demeaning and unprofessional. For a number of years teachers have been engaged in an effort to make themselves more professional and to gain control over what happens in the classroom. Only since 1938 has New York recognized that more than two years of college was necessary before one was qualified to be a teacher. Teaching was perceived as a job and teachers lacked status. In those days even veterinarians were required to have more college training. It has been a long struggle to achieve professional status.

Thus when the espousers of performance based certification came along and say "it is not how much college you've had, but the teaching competencies you possess", they fear that implies a loss of status. I'm resistant to such terms as "performance based certification" because such terms mean so many different things to different people. They also tend to become too rigid and threaten to routinize the entire teaching process. We must never make teaching so routine that "any fool can do it."

Dr. Salmon Performance based certification is a promising technique and promises to have a long life. It comes about because of the recognition that teachers were not being trained to do the job they wanted to or should have been. The focus of this process is what can you do, at what level and can it be certified. It is an important advancement and should be comforting to teachers because it focuses on demonstrated outcomes, they know what they can do.

Unfortunately we've had a tendency to over-promise what performance based certification can do, but let's give it a chance, admit there are weaknesses, and engineer out those weaknesses.

Issue II - Assessment and Accountability

by

Paul B. Salmon
Executive Secretary, American
Association of School Administrators

Why has this movement gained impetus? For the following mix of reasons, but not listed in any priority.

1. Rising expectations of postwar parents;

2. Increased financial investment in education;

3. Attitude that the professional know best;

4. Development of management by objectives and the belief that anything can be managed;

5. Increased sophistication of boards of education as they realize industry has developed measurement and accountability schemes that work;

6. Inability of educators to communicate pupil progress in commonly understood terms.

It is the belief of the lay public that accountability can change all of that. Some citizens believe accountability is a process whereby if the child fails to learn the teacher will be fired. Teacher organizations often see it in much the same light. If accountability is applied in this fashion however, it is misapplied.

As I see it accountability is a system for education whereby educators, legislators, board members, parents and other constituents examine resources and develop goals and objectives. From the objectives, programs are developed, implemented, monitored and updated as the results come in. Each level, each participant in the process understands what is expected. I also believe that in any accountability system, the participants must have a tolerance for imperfection because we just don't do things perfectly. Accountability need not be a fearsome thing because it really is a method of constantly improving educational programs for the best interests of students.

Reactors

Mr. Selden

Well, Paul, couched in those terms, who can quarrel. We all want to use resources more effectively and to see children learn more rapidly. Certainly if accountability is a constant system of measurement, a reassessment of methods and a reevaluation of goals, then teachers will be most supportive. However, if you slip into the emotional elements of the accountability movement, then teachers have difficulty with the notion. When people equate lack of student achievement with poor teaching, for instance, then it's another matter. No one has come forward with new objectives or new methods, they simply have said, "teach, get that, just teach."

Teachers resent that kind of approach. Efforts to equate salary and tenure to pupil performance are wasted. Teachers

have been accountable, but they resist efforts to equate teaching performance and pupil achievement. There simply isn't a one to one relationship between effort and results.

Education has been going through a kind of greening; there were things wrong and we have been doing something about it. For instance, before World War II only 50% made it through high school, and a high percentage not completing were black. Now 86% complete high school. If accountability can be defined as Paul has outlined, then I think education is ready to do some serious reevaluation of where it has been.

Mr. Bittenbender

I am not an expert as far as evaluation is concerned, but I will suggest to you that assessment and evaluation are here to stay. Mr. Bittenbender paraphrased an article from the New York times dealing with policemen. The article indicated that there is very little evidence to compare the productivity differences of policeofficers. Efforts to study productivity are resisted by the rank and file because of what they might show.] I would suggest that the parody between the sentiments of policeofficers regarding evaluation and between teachers and their feelings regarding accountability is similar indeed.

We lament the lack of money and yet in the last 25 years, educational expenditures have increased from 3.6% of the GNP to over 8% of the GNP. Education is the largest industry in the United States. As we talk then about educational expenditures of over $100 billion per year, the consuming public, the taxpayer, is going to demand accountability. They will demand it, and it will be had. What direction it takes, depends upon us. We must therefore develop accountability systems which involve all the members of the educational enterprise, teachers, administrators, school boards, the family, the community and the church.

Issue III - Teachers Right to Strike

by

David Selden
Former President, American Federation
of Teachers

In 1965 I wrote an article entitled, "Needed More Teacher Strikes." In that article I said that I didn't believe you could have collective bargaining without the right to strike. I still believe that. When you take away the right to strike you must have some kind of bureaucratic structure to insure that equity exists. I lose patience with people who want to limit the scope of bargaining, to keep them out of the policy

making process, and then turn around and ask, "Why are teachers so selfish, they're never concerned with the interests of children. There is a conflict there.

If you don't grant teachers the right to strike, what do we replace it with? How do you settle disputes? Fact finding, mediation, mediarb, arbitration? If people going into collective bargaining know from the outset that a dispute will be resolved by an administrative body, these people would be foolish to give up anything. Why not refer it all to the administrative body?

Another alternative to the strike is to go the lobbying route, lobby the legislators. But people say, "wait one minute, you're spending two million dollars in New York to gain your position, that's not right." OK, so give teachers the right to strike and let teachers seek to gain their point of view at the bargaining table.

The final alternative of course is one that continues to go on in many school districts and that is the cold war. These little wars of festering meanesses have been (and still are) being fought between teachers, administrators and school boards. In those systems no one can do anything right. If you can settle things at the bargaining table, even if it takes a strike to do it, I think the system and society would be better off.

Finally there is the matter of the loss of learning due to a strike. The purpose of education is to help children mature, but they don't stop maturing while you are trying to get things settled at the bargaining table. We've had some long strikes and scholars have tried to measure the learning loss due to the strike. It has been difficult to find out what the impact has been, if any. I think the damage we fear on the learning of children due to a strike has been grossly exaggerated.

The AFT has also attempted to bring reason into this whole matter of strikes. In the past we believed that strikes should occur in the spring before the budgets were adopted. It seemed to me however that this was not only bad public relations but disruptive of the educational process. Thus I advocated, and it caught on, that we should have multi-year contracts with the contracts coinciding with the school year, and with a rigidly enforced no contract, no work clause. Thus strikes now occur in the fall, and the opening of school is delayed, limiting the impact of the strike on the learning of children.

Well, now that I have convinced you all, I'm sure it must be time for a coffee break, isn't it?

Reactors

Dr. Salmon

The strike is the ultimate economic and political weapon available to teachers or other bargaining groups. School administrators are aware of that and are also aware that through collective bargaining teachers seek to share in power decisions. The difference between private sector bargaining and public sector bargaining is that in the public sector, employees bargain with the government. Since the government is the people, the question is, can you bargain with the people.

When I left the superintendency to take my current position, I came with a certain provincialism. But from my current vantage point I've discovered that we are on a continuum. In some states oligarchies still exist, where the board and administration run the system, to other districts where teachers have the right to strike.

The AASA believes that collective bargaining is a viable tool in working out differences between employees and employers. Indeed we urge our members to learn the skills of collective bargaining as rapidly as possible. We further believe the "no strike" clause is useless because it doesn't prevent strikes. It would be more effective if school managers spent time developing ways to keep the schools open during a strike. We believe that power can be shared and that there may be benefits in doing so.

I believe we must understand that we in education are working within a human institution, and that working conditions, the conditions of support for the educational system, and the aspirations of the people who work within the system are all important. Decisions impacting those conditions and aspirations must be shared and understood.

Mr. Bittenbender

The right of the people to peaceably assemble and to seek redress is clearly written in our constitution. The law is the basic root of our civilization; it comes not because of a political whim, but it comes because we know that no society can endure without the basic structure of law. Reconciling these two different points is a difficult task. The right to collectively bargain seems implicit in the constitutional phrase I have cited, but in no way does this give the right to an illegal strike. As a matter of fact, the teacher, administrator or school board who withhold the services in violation of a contract, perhaps have abandoned the most important responsibility they have - that is <u>to lead</u>.

The right to strike legally, I think is assured; the right to strike illegally is not only not assured but is contrary to every tenet basic in our civilization. The teacher, administrator, or board member who violates the fundamental tenet on which our civilization has progressed forgets that we are here because people in the past have honored their contracts. These are fundamental moral imperatives. The question is not one of cooperation between teachers and boards or about teachers having a right to join in the decision-making process. The basic question that faces every state board of education is "what rights shall be reserved to management in the goal setting - resource allocation process?"

I believe that if we turn over the management, control and administration of education to a teacher group that has become militant, that has become politically powerful, that it will degenerate into a them or us battle. I don't think there is any question that what we face is a monopoly of power, and I am opposed to that whether it be in government, in business, in industry or in the unions. Perhaps some consider no strike clauses as unimportant, I suggest however, that you as state board members had better make certain that your legislatures and your courts put some teeth into such laws, and make an illegal strike illegal so we can get on with the business of educating the children.

* * * * * *

The Constitution, The States, and Education: Recent Developments

by

J. Harold Flannery
Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law

We began our discussion of the constitutional responsibilities of the states for education last year in Portland. And as the term "recent developments" implies a relevant background, I think we should review that discussion briefly as today's starting point.

On many issues during our time the role of state educational agencies has been secondary to that of local educational agencies. The factors underlying this division of responsibility are not particularly mysterious or sinister. State legislatures have allocated power thus; much of the money for schools is raised and spent locally; and most state departments of education lack the resources to perform more than their oversight role.

This perception, as to where the action is, is reflected in the tendency of parents and other citizens to look first to their

LEA's on most questions, and even to start their reform (or other) lawsuits there. And it is also seen, I suggest, in the "flow through" nature of much federal aid to education.

To describe the status quo, however, is not to say that it is necessary or wise. Sound reasons may underlie the practice of local control with respect to particular issues, but nothing in our legal or educational history requires that we treat local control as an end in itself for all times, places, and purposes. Local educational control may be traditional, but I hope it is no less a part of our tradition to reexamine our practices, periodically and critically, to ensure that they are serving us as well as available alternatives.

I believe it was in that context that, in the late nineteen-sixties, some education lawyers began to reexamine the question of your responsibilities with respect to particular issues. From that reexamination two notions emerged that are relevant to this discussion. First, school districts within a state and their consumers, the children, may differ, but do such differences as may exist warrant the disparities in educational practices that may exist between the districts? Urban district A probably does differ from rural district B, but it is questionable whether the differences would warrant, for example, providing free textbooks in one but not the other. Other examples can be cited.

The second perception that emerged was that, although our Federal Constitution is silent about public education--thus committing it to non-federal responsibility, most of the Constitution's commands, including particularly those of the 14th Amendment, are addressed to the states. That is, for example, that language of the 14th Amendment which says that no state shall deny the equal protection of the laws appears to hold the states accountable for the conduct of all their public bodies. That language does not acknowledge autonomy on the part of local public bodies, nor does it "constitutionalize," if you will, local educational control. Put too colloquially, perhaps, but I think fairly, that language says to the states: you have wide latitude with respect to your educational arrangements, but there are limits that may not be transgressed, and if that happens it will not be a constitutional defense to say that your de facto autonomous political subdivision, rather than a state-level authority, committed the transgression.

This second notion has been tried out on the courts in a number of school desegregation cases in the last half-decade or so. In some of the cases a state-level authority, such as Governor Wallace for instance, had actually impeded the racial desegregation of local school districts. But in other cases the state authorities had merely done nothing. In both sets of circumstances the courts held that the responsibility for meeting constitutional requirements is that of the states. And the state-level defendants were charged

to take specific steps vis-a-vis local districts looking toward the fulfillment of constitutional obligations.

The application of this principle presents an interesting further question that some of you have raised in our prior discussions. It is whether the courts are limited to requiring the particular exercise of powers conferred upon state boards by their own constitutions and laws, or whether the courts may, in effect, confer upon state boards powers not allocated to them under particular existing state arrangements. For example, may a court, on the basis of the Supremacy Clause or otherwise, require a state board to withhold funds from a local district under circumstances not authorized by that state's constitution and laws?

Anticlimactially, perhaps, I would like to avoid that question or at least defer it. Its implications of constitutional confrontation make it a difficult question, but it is also, I believe, a diversionary one. To focus attention upon it can too easily become a mechanism for avoiding application of the promising and easier principle that state educational authorities may indeed be required to exert the powers that are theirs toward constitutional ends.

It was against this background that we discussed various education cases last year, including Rodriguez, Detroit, and Denver. My view then was that, although the courts will not relieve local school authorities of their constitutional obligations, you would be well advised to prepare to share the fulfillment of those obligations in ways that you may initially find unfamiliar.

The courts have continued to address these questions since our last meeting. The Supreme Court's decision in the Detroit case bears upon our inquiry as, to some extent, do the lower court decisions in the Boston, Dayton and Indianaplis school desegregation cases and the Chicago-area discrimination in housing case.

In the Detroit case the plaintiffs made, and the lower courts upheld, essentially two claims about the state's responsibility for providing a racially desegregated education for children in Detroit and its environs. It was argued first that Detroit children are entitled to racially non-identifiable schools after a finding of illegal segregation, and that the state may not interpose its political subdivision boundaries as an "arbitrary" impedient to meeting that entitlement. It was argued secondly that the foregoing principle should have particular force where the state was a direct participant in the Detroit segregation violations, and where some evidence suggested that the segregation of Detroit as a school system was the result, at least in part, of acts and practices by public authorities--including school authorities.

As you know the Supreme Court declined to require desegregation across school district lines on the basis of the record before it. In my view, however, the Court did not negate the principle of state accountability as we have been considering it. Rather, the Court reaffirmed the doctrine of ultimate state responsibility but, focussing on its perception of the scope of the constitutional violation, the Court declined to invoke the doctrine as contended for by the plaintiffs-appellees. [Here Mr. Flannery cited from the Detroit Court opinion (these cites were not included in the speech text)]

If I am correct in my reading of the opinions of the justices constituting a majority, I suggest that a state's responsibility for meeting constitutional requirements will, upon proper facts, take precedence over a state's preference for particular arrangements of convenience.

In Dayton, Ohio, the state contended that it should not be a party defendant at all in the school desegregation case. They argued that constitutional defaults, if any, were those of local Dayton authorities only, and that only such authorities should be held accountable therefor. The Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit disagreed: [Here Mr. Flannery cited from the Dayton Court opinion (these cites were not included in the speech text)]

Here again, I suggest, the court did not probe the outer perimeter of state responsibility, but clearly it declined to exempt the state for responsibility for the unconstitutional condition of one of its districts.

The Boston case, which was decided by the federal district court in June, may be read as a further illustration of this principle. The plaintiffs there claimed, among other things, that the state authorities (as well as the local primary defendants) should be held liable for illegal segregation in Boston because they had acquiesced in illegal local practices and had failed effectively to enforce state laws against school segregation.

The court disagreed on the facts and exonerated the state defendants of liability. However, the court did not stop there. With respect to the principle of ultimate constitutional responsibility it went on to hold: [Here Mr. Flannery cited from the Boston Court opinion (these cites were not included in the speech text)]

The most recent court of appeals decision in the Indianapolis school desegregation case, in August of this year, echoes this theme. The court followed the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Detroit case in holding that, on the record presented, desegregation need not extend to suburbs that were unaffected by the constitutional violation. But the court did not hold that state-level authorities were immune from participation in relief; nor did it hold that

school district boundaries could not be crossed without state approval. [Here Mr. Flannery cited from the Indianapolis Court opinion (these cites were not included in the speech text)]

As a final illustration of this principle, that state authorities may be required to abridge their preferred jurisdictional arrangements to achieve constitutional objectives, I invite your attention to the decision in August of this year of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in Gautreaux v. Chicago Housing Authority. [Here Mr. Flannery cited from the Chicago Court opinion (these cites were not included in the speech text)]

On the basis of these decisions since our last meeting, I believe I can report to you that the principle of ultimate state responsibility for securing constitutional rights is alive and well. We have some additional data now as to when and under what circumstances that principle will be invoked to override contrary present state arrangements. And some may argue that traditional state prerogatives have been reaffirmed, and that a confrontation between today's claims and yesterday's convenience has been avoided or postponed.

Well, perhaps it has been postponed. But I can promise you that it has not been avoided. Perhaps it is evidence of their faith in America and its institutions, but I believe it is clear that constitutional claimants will continue to litigate against practices and devices that they believe are frustrating their enjoyment of rights and opportunities that some of the rest of us take for granted.

Therefore, I think you should ask yourselves, as state officials who are ultimately responsible for constitutional education, what do recent court decisions portend for us? What can we do to avoid a judicial impact that is not felt because it was not needed?

I have no uniformly applicable prescription or agenda; you in the first instance are the surest judges of your problems and your leverage for attacking those problems.

I am convinced, however, that if you make that analysis carefully, and if you exert that leverage fully, you will be able to say credibly to a court or in any other forum: we at least have done our best.

* * * * * *

State Boards Examined and Found Wanting

by

Tim L. Mazzoni, Jr., Assistant Professor,
Educational Administration, Univ. of Minnesota

Sometime ago, I believe it was at an ECS meeting in June, Bob McBride asked me whether I would like to report to this group about the educational governance project, and particularly about its findings relative to state boards of education. I told him that, in our best judgment, these findings were not always what state board members would want to hear, but I did feel an obligation to talk to you about them.

I'm going to make my report in five parts. Although Bob has mentioned it, I would like to say some things briefly about the project, particularly about its objectives and its methods.

Second, I'd like to state a few of our main conclusions about the policy-making role of state boards, at least as the boards we studied appeared to us at the time of the study, two years ago.

Third, I'd like to discuss some of the evidence that we drew upon to reach those conclusions.

Fourth, I would note that boards did vary in their perceived influence, and I'd like to suggest some of the reasons why.

And finally, I feel an obligation -- speaking, I guess, for the governance project, and speaking particularly for Roald Campbell to set forth our recommendations.

The Project. The governance project had two major objectives: first, to extend our knowledge of the policy-making process, particularly as state governments determine policy for K through 12 schools and second, to develop a set of alternative models for state educational governance that would be of use to people like yourselves. The project began in January of 1972 and ended in August 1974. Funding throughout this entire period came from the U.S. Office of Education under Section 505 of Title V of ESEA. The policy board for the project consisted of our Chairman, Dr. Martin Essex from the State of Ohio, Jack Nix from Georgia, and Dr. Ewald Nyquist from New York. These gentlemen gave to us their energetic support and constructive criticism; while they did not always agree with us in terms of specific findings or interpretational values, generally, I think, they supported the

thrust of the project. We also had the benefits of an advisory body, on which Bob McBride served.

The bulk of the field work was done from Ohio State University by a research team directed by Roald Campbell, with myself serving as the Associate Director. The field work was done in 12 states, however, we only looked at ten as far as state boards were concerned. The field work was done toward the end of 1972 and the beginning of 1973.

Research itself was done by teams of two or three people, who spent an average of three weeks in each of the 12 states. Most of what they did while they were there consisted of interviewing a variety of actors, chief state school officers, state board members, top state department administrators, legislative leaders from education committees and various money committees, the House and Senate leadership, and governors when we could. If governors were not available we talked either to governors' aides or to members of the governors' staff. Also interviewed were the directors of finance in every state and various representatives of the educational interest groups, NEA, AFT, school boards and administrator organizations, representatives of large city school districts, etcetera. All in all, approximately 425 structured interviews and several hundred unstructured interviews were conducted; we also collected a variety of documents, examined newspaper files, handed out a drop-off questionnaire, and, in general, tried our best to gather as much information as we could about policy-making at the state level in those 12 states.

We took all this data and generated from it one state report per state. We hope that people will find them useful; that they will at least stimulate discussion and debate in terms of what groups of outsiders may have seen in their states.

In addition to the individual state reports, we have produced two reports that try to say something about the situation across all twelve states, or, in the case of state boards, all ten states. The first document is entitled, "State Policy Making for the Public Schools: A Comparative Analysis." It basically looks at the roles of state boards, chief state school officers, top-level state department administrators, governors, legislative leaders across the states that we examined. It finishes with a summary chapter, and some recommendations written by Roald Campbell and myself.

The second document is entitled, "State Governance Models for the Public Schools" and it's our effort to put before people interested in state governance some alternatives that they might consider in restructuring the institutional arrangements with regard to educational policy making.

Policy Making. Our purpose at no time was to assess through the application of some evaluative standards the performance of state boards, chief state school officers, legislative leaders, governors, or much of anybody else. We did not look at the performance of these bodies through the full range of their governance responsibilities. As I said, we tried to look at policy making. We tried to look at the process by which state goals and major priorities are set. We examined the decisions of "who gets what." Our interest was looking at "who gets what" in two separate arenas: in the legislative arena--governors, legislative leaders, the central actors--and in the arena of the state education agency board members, chief state school officers, and top state department administrators. Furthermore, in looking at policy making, we also looked at who gets involved, how they participated and what effects they appeared to have. We were not satisfied however, with just looking at the end-stage of the process. We didn't just look at enactment and who formalized it. We were particularly interested in who decides what the isses are; who decides what appears on the agenda of issues; who makes the determination as to what proposals will be formulated, and who actually formulates them; how support is mobilized for the proposal and how the attempt to influence the policy making process. Finally, we examined how the final choice gets made.

Let me restate that. Our concern was policy making, not policy implementation or policy adjudication. Our concern was not the enactment phase, but a broader consideration of that process, involving the definition of issues, the formulation of alternatives, the mobilization of support, and finally, enactment.

Policy making, and influence in policy making, is an extremely complex subject. Influence, itself, is a particularly slippery notion. We tried to get at that slippery notion through two distinct ways. One, we selected a number of issue areas or decisions, and looked at those. In each state we tried to ask ourselves, "who participates in the making of school finance policy?" We were interested in who makes certification policy. While it was more of a routine issue, we thought it a highly important one and one likely to allow us to examine the agency and its interaction with educational interest groups in the policy making process. We asked a third issue-oriented question: "Who makes state policy on school segregation?" Finally, we asked questions in the educational program improvement area. For most states, this got into the area of assessment, accountability or evaluation. To examine the policy process, then, we used a set of issues. We picked these issues in advance and we tried to look at them in each of the twelve states.

There were great difficulties in this. Many said we had selected the wrong issues in their state and we were told that

if we had looked at something they were very much involved in, collective bargaining, curriculum; school district organization, etc., we would have seen very different things. Perhaps. Also issues are enormously difficult in terms of the time and energy required to look at them in depth, and in some cases our analysis did not have the depth it should have.

Finally, looking at decisions is not a very good way to get at behind-the-scenes activity, overt influence, or the notion of influence through anticipation. Looking at overt behavior doesn't lend itself to the detection of those sorts of influences. So, in addition to looking at decisions, we asked a lot of general kinds of questions. We asked questions of a whole range of actors to this effect: How important do you think a state board is in actually formulating and working for education policy? Do you think the state board ever takes the lead in the area of educational legislation? Does the state board give real direction to the chief state school officer or does it basically formalize his recommendations? Yes, we asked a lot of those kinds of questions, to board members and chiefs, but, most of all, to external individuals, to legislative leaders, governors, staff people, educational interest groups. All in an effort to see if we could get some useful, general assessments of influence in policy making.

Neither method I have suggested, no matter how skillfully applied, no matter what resources committed, is fool-proof. We did the best we could through the methods that I have just discussed, through a decision approach, and then through some general power attribution questions. What did we find? Let me state two conclusions. (1) Our data reveal that some actors for example, governors and chief state school officers, are influential in many policy systems in education, at least on issues of salience to them. (2) Our data also point, on balance, to the weakness of many state boards of education as policy making participants. Though some individual board members and some boards did not fit this pattern, the typical state board we studied was widely assessed by legislative leaders, governors' offices, and educational interest groups spokesmen, as well as by the Educational Governance Project field researchers, as being only minor participants in education legislation, including the crucial area of school finance. And, while the state board was much more influential in state education agency policy making, even in that arena the central and too often dominant figure was the chief state school officer, with the board being cast largely in a legitimating role.

I'm well aware one might pick other language to characterize those findings, but in reading it over it still seems to me that that's basically what we found.

Evidence Used to Reach Conclusions. What sort of evidence did we consult to bring us to that conclusion? We tried to talk in

each state to a cross-section of people. We tried to ask them questions about their perceptions, their assessments and their evaluations. Maybe we talked to the wrong people; maybe these people weren't well informed; but in every state we talked to those people we identified as legislative leadership, to the key people from the governor's office, in the state agency, among the education interest groups, and among board members themselves.

In respect to the role of state boards in the legislative arena, one that I characterize in many states as being marginal, we had findings like these: Most legislative leader respondents, and we talked to some 150 across the twelve states, evaluated their state board as either being of minor importance--50% indicated that--or of no importance at all, 22% indicated that. In formally working for education legislation, about one quarter--this tended to be concentrated in a relatively few states--said the board was important in this process. I might say that these respondents--because we pushed them, we asked them "why" questions, why they believed that, what reasons could they give for their assessment--tended to emphasize these factors about the state boards in their states. (1) The apolitical tradition of the board, (its historic non-involvement in something called politics), (2) the lack of board visibility to lawmakers (we had more than one or two say to us, "Well, I don't know any state board members; I don't know what they do, what functions they perform"); (3) the absence of political clout, (the absence of the ability to mobilize constituents of importance to lawmakers); and (4) the board's heavy dependence on the chief state school officer. (It was the chief that legislators turned to for advice, for counsel, for information, neither did they always see the chief as being clearly the agent of the board.) We asked the same kinds of questions to board members. More than half did feel that they could have some means of influence with legislators. Of that group, another half suggested personal persuasion as that means. When we asked legislative leaders in those same states, however, most of them could recall no such contacts with board members, and those that could recall them, indicated that this did not happen often.

We felt perhaps we needed to get outside this process of talking to legislative leaders or board members. We asked education lobbyists what they thought and found them to be very knowledgeable. And we asked them: "Okay, what about the state board? Do you think it takes the lead here in respect to education legislation?" The answer, strongly, was no, this coming from about 70% of the spokesmen for these organizations. Of course you say, "Well, what about the issues, didn't you look at the issues?" Yes, we looked at the issues. We tried to figure out who made the difference in school finance; I can assure you, in most cases, not the state board. They did take positions--we could find written accounts and records, we could find evidence of transmission--but we found little evidence of real impact.

Maybe we didn't dig deep enough. Perhaps, if we'd dug deeper we'd have found individual members of the board collectively giving important input early in this process. If we didn't dig deep enough, I'm sorry, but that's what we found with the resources we were able to commit.

We also moved from the legislative arena and looked at the role of the board in the state education agency arena. I must say this look was clouded by several factors. There's a strong tendency, and a very understandable one, for boards, chiefs and state departments to look at themselves as representing one kind of unity, not separable into the compartments we tried to separate them into; that's part and parcel of the notion of the team operation. We could understand that. But from our point of view we failed to understand the relationships here; we did find that boards were clearly much more influential in this arena than they appeared to be in the legislative arena. However, the data gave us the impression that it was the chief state school officer who played the central role. The state board very often was cast at the end of the process, in a legitimating capacity. We looked at this by trying to decide who made agenda decisions, not who could make them; but who, in fact made them. As people told us about these kinds of decisions, we tried to examine where board members got information, if they utilized external sources, how they validated information, and so forth. As before, we asked the education interest groups to give us their perceptions of where real direction came from. They said from the chief.

We also examined the four issue areas. When we looked at certification we found that people didn't remember it very well. There were no written traces of who did what--oh, there were task forces, committees, and groups of every size and shape--but as to who made a difference people could not distinguish. When we looked at the issue of desegregation, we found some conspicuous examples of board leadership in New York, Massachusetts, and Minnesota. We also found some conspicuous examples of leadership when we looked at education improvement. But the overall result tended to confirm the perceptions of the people we talked to, namely, less involvement, less activity at the early stages of the policy process, than we might have suspected, knowing the legal powers of state boards.

That is a statement of our general findings. I could have worded it differently, but I trust that carries the message.

Difference Between Boards. All boards, of course, didn't look the same nor did all board members; there were great variations. Maybe we don't do justice by talking about the typical, or what we thought was the typical board. Some boards clearly were more involved at an earlier stage in the policy making process, they pushed harder, sought information sources, were constructive critics of their chiefs, probably at every turn; others did not rank very well. We were interested in the variation. Why were some boards more aggressively involved in policy decisions than

others? Clearly, one answer was context, with California and Massachusetts being a great deal different than say Texas, in terms of the involvement of the legislature. Some legislatures--and I'll use California and Massachusetts as an example--seem to be actively and extensively involved, and we really wondered how much of a role was left to the board in many areas. Many board members seemed to share that concern. Other legislatures on the other hand, seemed willing and had historically been willing, though some changes were taking place, to delegate much more authority to the agency and the board. New York and Texas would fall in that category. Perhaps those contextual aspects, the involvement of other governmental actors, was what was crucial in explaining what role was really open to the board. In attempting to determine why some boards were more influential policy makers we also looked at how much authority boards had, how much time board members devoted their role, how much emphasis they put on policy, as opposed to routine, in their meetings, did board members value highly the kinds of information they got from the state department, and did that qualitative assessment seem to be related to a board's capacity to deal with policy, how cohesive the board was, and finally, the loosest of all, how much status did the board seem to have among all these other policy actors that we interviewed? In short, we tried to measure some of our data.

Having tried to measure or rank the boards with respect to influence, we asked, What goes with that? We asked, did you find anything out? Here's what I think we found out: it probably is true that there's a relationship between having more board authority and being more widely perceived as influential policy makers. The boards that had more authority tended to be toward the top. Authority, in what sense? Constitutional or statutory authority, scope of authority in respect to institutions and most importantly, the power to appoint and to remove the chief. The boards which we examined that lacked the authority to hire and fire the chief all tended to be at the bottom of our ranking, a fact that we hold to be quite probably significant.

Second, we found that to the degree that members from boards that said they emphasized non-routine matters (policy concerns) tended to rank toward the top. Boards that were happy with the kind of information they received from state departments of education tended to be toward the top. The time board members put in--when comparing boards that said, "we put in a week or more during a month on board business"--with those that said, "oh, we put in a couple of days"--surprisingly enough, didn't show much. Most surprising, our feeble efforts to measure the status of state boards and they're so feeble I'm kind of sorry we reported them, suggest that status does not explain much. It was a factor however, that when we asked people in the state, "Well, what contributes to the strength of your state board? Why should people listen to them?", the general answer had something to do

with the prestige of the board and/or its members. While that was the most commonly given response when we tried a simple correlation analysis, we couldn't show a correlation.

We also asked board members about the expectations they had for chief state school officers. Our findings show no policy-administration dichotomy on this question. Board members, at least those that we talked to conceived of a very expansive role for chief state school officers. They see the chief as playing the key role, as innovator, formulator, advocate, and influencer of educational policy making. I will also say that boards which took a less expansive view of the chief's role tended to be those which were toward the top of our influence ranking.

Finally, we tested the category "does selection and appointment" make any difference with regard to policy-making. We couldn't observe any differences which could even reasonably be related to the selection method. There were some differences, however, and I might just briefly report those. The elected boards did seem to be a bit more responsive, more reactive to external constituents. There appeared to be more conflict associated with elected boards. Finally, we found that elected boards as a whole proceed more postively in the policy making process than appointed boards, particularly in respect to the legislature. You could say, well, so what? Maybe it's because these boards are going through the same kind of elected process, can claim constituents, people with more political sensitivity, what have you. Our reason for it says, it probably doesn't have anything to do with the fact that all four of our elected boards appointed their chief; three of our five appointed boards did not. In other words, our analysis suggests that control over the chief state school officer (the process where the board can appoint and remove their chief executive officer) is related to perceived influence of state boards.

Recommendations. What do we recommend from all this? First we gave a great deal of thought as to whether we should recommend anything. I must also say we had many suggestions as to what to recommend. If I could emphasize nothing else, these are facts that don't speak for themselves; we don't make any claim that they do. We decided to do the study, we picked what to study, and we picked how to do it. We organized and arranged the findings, we interpreted the findings, and those interpretations were affected by our values; that's the way it has to be. Other reasonable, thoughtful, and concerned people could read our data and come to different interpretations. In the end we felt we had to say something about it. Now there were a few who said, what you really found is that we should do away with state boards. That was very strongly expressed to me by a finger-waving gentleman, who told me that boards cannot serve as vehicles either for political accountability or for citizen representation, therefore a centralized executive approach should be adopted which would better achieve these values. Others in the same vein have argued for full time, fully compensated boards. On the other side of the

coin are those who suggested what is, is good enough; it represents the proper position.

I guess we need to suggest what our values are. I use the word "our" because they're Roald Campbell's the staff's and mine. In the end, I guess we believe in our governing boards. We don't believe in them because they're part of the historical legacy in this country; we believe in them because we still feel, and all our data can support it, that these boards can be effective instruments for representing citizens in public policy making and for bringing citizen influence to bear in that process. We are not dissuaded from that view.

Second, we believe, and we know that this belief is not shared by others, that state boards should have an active policy role. We're all aware that you all have a policy role now. I guess what we're suggesting is that it seems to us in too many cases it comes too late and is too little. Included in the active policy role is the personal institutional respect for the legislature; that's where much of the action is, that's where the big resource decisions are made. To be excluded from that process is to be excluded from a central process determining who gets what. We don't think boards can or should be so excluded.

Finally we believe that it's possible to strengthen state boards; we think they should be strengthened and that this can be done without eroding or removing important prerogatives from the chief. To put it bluntly, we think both the board's and the chief's influence can and should go hand in hand, and our data suggests that. We also tried to measure the influence of chief state school officers; again, it tended to run with influential boards. We don't think it's a zero-sun game. Out of these beliefs, then, let me state ten of our recommendations. We have others, but we have ten that represent modest proposals for strengthening state boards.

(1) We recommend that state boards be constitutionally established, be delegated broad discretionary authority for education policy making by the legislature, including control over teacher preparation and certification.

(2) We believe that state boards should be able to appoint and remove the chief state school officer; we add to that our belief that it should also include a systematic evaluation of the chief's performance. In order for there to be sufficient time to develop and implement programs, the chief should serve a fixed term and we recommend three years.

(4) We further recommend, because we're concerned about the representativeness of state boards, that particular attention be given to making this body broadly representative of the different interests and backgrounds of the state's citizens.

5) We further recommend that besides the customary reimbursement for expenses, board members be compensated for their part-time service at levels sufficient to allow more persons with modest

incomes to serve on state boards. We think you people don't represent as many Americans, as many groups, as you should. That's our bias. We think that you should think hard about how that might be broadened. I guess it troubles me to look out and not see as many blacks, as many women, as many young folks as I think I should in our audience. I think state boards can and should be important policy makers. And I guess my bias is to a broadly representative body.

6) We further recommend that provisions be made for pre-service and in-service training of state board members, especially regarding their policy making relationships with legislators, governors, chiefs, and interest groups.

7) We recommend, at a rather general level, that the policy role expectations which board members hold for themselves and for the chief state school officer should be carefully and continually examined by these officials, with the attempt being to establish and maintain an appropriate balance between public control and professional expertise in education policy making. We recognize the contending claims here and the different values represented, and I guess what we're arguing for is balance. In some cases we think the balance needs to be restored.

8) It is recommended that along with using institutional mechanisms and department administrators, state board members should develop channels of personal access to state lawmakers and be willing to use these channels actively in seeking to influence educational legislation in accordance with board policy. This is not "an every man or every woman for himself or herself" recommendation, but it suggests personal involvement in accordance with board policy. Yes, I don't shy from the term lobbying, though I do not give to it all of its perjorative connotations.

9) It is recomended that state board members be provided with staff assistance to help in issue identification and in data analysis. In some states persons from the office of the chief state school officer might have sufficient independence to serve this function. In at least a few states we recommend that staff assistance independent of the office of the chief be employed. In no case should these assistants assume any administrative functions for the agency.

10) It is recomended that board officials and chiefs seek to enhance public awareness of the state board. I guess we were disturbed, not by public opinion polling, we didn't do any of it, by polling of policy leaders at the state level, how many of them suggested they didn't know board members, didn't know what the board did. We found this to be a disturbing finding. Public awareness is most likely to be fostered if the state board focuses its energies on important policy issues and actively as well as openly seeks to deal with them.

In the governance report we make some recommendations for chiefs. While many will disagree with us, we hope the recommendations will have utility in stimulating thinking about the office and how people relate to it. Two recommendations, however, have particular relevance to state boards, and I conclude with these. We recomend that chiefs and boards find new ways of enhancing their partnership without diminishing the initiating role of the chief. This seems to us to mean that the chief must more frequently begin the development of his proposals from the express concern of the board members, that board members must more frequently offer constructive criticism to the chief on his proposals, and that board members must more frequently take advocacy roles with governors and legislatures. We further recommend that chiefs encourage organization of their state boards to permit careful consideration of policy questions. This may require, at least with large boards, some kind of committee structure, an adequate allocation of time to board members, the establishment of agendas which focus largely on policy questions and less on implementation, and the provision of pertinent background data.

That constitutes ten or so of the 20 plus recommendations we make to conclude this report. The last thing we say in that report is this: we didn't go ahead and try to draw one model for educational governance, one blueprint that all states might find useful at all times. We don't think there is any such blueprint. States vary so enormously in their needs and their stages of development, their histories and personalities, that there is no one such model. Indeed, we would say even of our own recommendations that we don't look at them as applicable across all states and all times, but as something to think about at a given point in time, by state policy leaders, by the people who have to work with them and use them. Thank you.

* * * * * * *

The Midas Touch

By

Virginia Y. Trotter
Assistant Secretary for Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

I want to compliment you on your theme, "Challenges to State Board Effectiveness", it reflects the earnestness of the National Association of State Boards of Education to deal directly and productively with issues most affecting the success of future efforts of state boards.

In the last few months with so much traveling, I have realized that the image of the federal government is that of a gigantic bureaucracy, but more than that, the <u>image</u> of a King Midas -- a computer, a machine -- making and -- spending money, -- with very little sensitivity to the needs of the individual.

It is true that the federal government is a gigantic machine and a bureaucracy of budgets and management, but it is more than that, it is people -- sensitive, concerned, creative, dedicated -- in trying to do the best they can -- to realize the goal of the individual student reaching his or her highest potential.

Our society's belief in the value of education is stronger than ever. The individual's quest for knowledge and understanding, the desire to learn to his or her fullest capacity are basic values and one that together we can achieve.

There has never been, and I believe there should not be an all-encompassing role for the federal government in this country comparable to that of a ministry of education -- where national governments are charged with the responsibility of funding, planning, and the managing of education. Rather, the federal government has concerned itself with creating conditions under which the educational needs of American society are most likely to be met first hand, in the States.

Among the most significant parts of the Education Amendments of 1974 in addition to training are the provisions for advance funding of various grants to states. This will do much to the uncertainty that has characterized federal funding of education programs in recent years.

This is something the National Association of State Boards of Education has long sought -- and helped to achieve.

Another very important component of the Amendments is that they consolidate a number of categorical programs supporting libraries, educational innovation and other services. This gives state boards and local education agencies much greater flexibility and allows them to determine their own priorities in these areas.

The consolidation provisions of the Amendments are a great step forward in reform of educational legislation; but it is not as far as we want to go. In the coming months, we expect to make specific recommendations to Congress to consolidate the current vocational education programs into a broader authority that will give the states greater flexibility in the use of vocational funds.

Looking ahead, another one of our priorities is career education.

It is our hope that every student will possess the skills necessary to prepare him or her for a successful career. It is my personal feeling that career education should also give each student the necessary skills to live life to his or her fullest capacities. It is education for living.

Another great responsibility of state boards for implementing legislation concerns Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. Title IX prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex for all educational programs benefiting from federal financial assistance.

We lieve in a world filled with preconceived concepts of masculinity-feminity. From earliest childhood we have our different roles sharply outlined for us. Children's aspirations develop at a very early age. Through the visual stimuli of mass communication, through the interaction with role models, through direct and indirect verbal messages, children learn who is smart -- who is powerful -- who can be creative -- who can be independent -- who will be successful -- who will fail.

We can be sure that thousands of women across our country will not be satisfied with the status quo in educational and employment opportunity. Whether or not there will be changes in counseling techniques, textbooks, curriculum and so on will depend a great deal on how you provide the facilitating structure for change.

Education is now one of the five largest sectors in the national economy, employing over 7 percent of the civilian labor force; currently $96.3 billion, roughly 7.5 percent of the nation's gross product is committed to the schooling of the nation's 59 million students. The policies of the education community will, therefore, affect the general economy, as well as be affected by it.

As educators and administrators you have recognized inflation is just one more input in the ever-increasing complexity of our social and technological systems. It becomes more difficult, but more essential than ever before -- to provide an education through which the individual can come to grips with his or her own values, with those of his or her society and with those of the broader world beyond. Educators must provide a steadily widening base on which a person can continue to learn and grow as an individual regardless of age. Helping people to learn, helping people to cope, to diagnose and analyze, and to solve their own problems are the major challenges to both the federal government and the States.

We are only beginning to effect change--and it will take much time and effort. The Midas Touch--Yes--but even more important--the human touch--to make it work. Men and women who know that the educational destinies of the student, the teacher, the administrator, the guidance counselor, the institution, the State and the Federal government are identical. The human touch--yes--together to achieve individuality, life planning, productivity, joy in achievement of goals and the sense of well-being in the home, the community, the country.

In two years we will be celebrating our 200th birthday, the great leaps of creative intelligence that pushed back the American frontier must now be put to work on the most magnificent project of all--men and women working together----creating a human environment. Congenial not just to the physical presence but to the human spirit.

* * * * * * *

Race and Higher Education in America

by

Kenneth B. Clark
N.Y. State Board of Regents

I cannot pretend to be objective nor promise to be clear in expressing my feelings about higher education. These barriers to objectivity and clarity are made even more difficult to hurdle when one who is black dares to discuss the compound problem of higher education and race in America.

In every complex society, education is viewed and used as the chief instrument by which stratification is maintained or mobility facilitated. This opportunity for mobility through education is the substance of the American promise of a functionally classless democracy.

The role of equal educational opportunity as the key to a functional democracy in America has been complicated from the beginning of American history by the permeating fact of American racism.

The most concrete manifestation of the continuing dominance of racial considerations in the educational process is to be found in the existence of segregated, bi-racial elementary and higher educational school systems which were supported by law prior to the Brown decision of May, 1954 and which persist in fact throughout the nation up to the present.

It is in fact ironic that in the last quarter of the 20th century--there remains the anachronism of qualifying educational institutions and educational goals in terms of the stark, tribal superstitions of race. It is odd that we, as educators at this period of human history, matter-of-factly, without embarrassment or apology, still talk about "white schools" and "black schools," "white colleges" and "black colleges."

On May 17, 1954 the United States Supreme Court under the leadership of the late Justice Earl Warren arrived at this ultimate, logical, legal, educational, psychological, and moral conclusion

"that separate educational facilities are inherently unequal." The clear educational implications of that decision are 1) that there is no place in a democracy for a bi-racial educational system; 2) that given the history of American racism and the contemporary realities, segregated education at the elementary, college, university, and professional school levels are non-adaptive anachronisms which not only violate the promises of democracy, but also contaminate the fundamental goals of education; 3) that any form of segregated school is a concrete manifestation of the inherent inequity, the superstition and the myth of racism; and 4) that segregated school perpetuate this dangerous, undemocratic, cruel, and dehumanizing myth--and damage all of the human beings who are forced to be involved in any way with them.

If there are no other indications of the profound effects of racially contaminated education, the fact that educators remained silent, defaulted on this most significant educational and human issue, while lawyers in the courts and civil rights organizations were forced to take the initiative, this in itself would be sufficient evidence.

This disturbing fact is reinforced by the added embarrassment of the number of educators and educational officials who assumed the role of apologists and defenders of racially segregated schools. Some of these educators defended their apologetic roles on the ground of realism which required them to be sensitive to the wishes of the majority and particularly to be responsive to political officials whom they believed had the power to determine their destiny.

For the most part American educators, educational officials, educational organizations, and local and state boards of education did not or were not able to define the process, the objectives, and the goals of democratic education in the 20th century in the clear, moral, and ideological terms which would on the face be contradictive of the pervasive and vulgar superstition of race. On the contrary, they accepted, either by their silence or by active advocacy, the contamination of the educational process by the constrictive, intellectual, and moral poisons of pervasive American racism. In doing so they are accessories to the crime of infecting generations of American children with this debilitating disease.

One would have expected that after the Brown decision of 1954 that educators would have been encouraged to become involved, even though belatedly, in the democratization of American education. In spite of gains which, paradoxically, for the most part are to be found in the southern states, there remain persistent, rigid, pervasive patterns of racial contamination in American education.

There is a continuation of not only the semantics but the fact of "white" schools and colleges. It is considered normal to talk about "black schools," "black colleges."

The function of education is to free the human mind of the tyranny of superstition. Were it not for racism there would be no need for white colleges or black colleges. There would be colleges devoted to the heroic role of seeking to free the human mind, the human spirit, and human creativity from constrictive and, in a nuclear age, ultimately dangerous tribalism and parochialism.

In recent years, the symptoms of racial contamination of American higher education tend to take more subtle forms. One of the clearest examples of these not very subtle forms of racial contamination are the black studies courses, black studies divisions, and the black studies departments which sprung up during the past decade like weeds after a prolonged rainfall. Almost invariably they suffer from the same inevitable symptoms of the more honest, traditional forms of segregation; namely, separate and inferior. Aside from the inherent condescension and conscious or unconscious racism of such explanations, which all too frequently are offered by well-intentioned individuals who would resent any classification of them as even unconscious racists, it is this observer's opinion that educational administrators and boards of directors who permit such segregated facilities within allegedly integrated educational institutions are violating the law and the Constitution of the United States.

It is the responsibility of those charged with this most important function of defining and guiding the educational goals of a society to be clear about those goals. From the perspective of this observer this difficult and imperative function cannot be performed by educational officials who succumb to the prevailing prejudices and limitations of their students and the general public.

When educators and educational officials are able to mobilize the courage to meet this complex and difficult problem of the contamination of American education by American racism, they will be free of the pretentious postures of such allaged educational programs as open enrollment and the various forms of "enrichment" programs for the culturally deprived. They will then be prepared to address themselves to such fundamental educational pursuits as providing a sound, solid, morally effective education for all of our students without regard to their color or religious or other artificial classification which man insists upon imposing upon himself.

We must understand and accept the challenging fact that the function of education is to help man deal more constructively with the inevitable embarrassment inherent in his self-consciousness and the incipient awareness of the limitations, the fragility of his own being.

I ask you as fellow educators and fellow educational officials to take your divine responsibilities so seriously as to assume all the necessary risks to fulfill them; to take our students and our fellow man so seriously as to stand up for our values; to state them clearly; to insist upon them in spite of conflict and controversy and the strong possibility of reprisals. Our genuine values are worth these risks. The alternatives--the dominance of even the most sophisticated forms of ignorance and social superstitions--are catastrophic in a nuclear age.

Appendix A

Mini-Conference Evaluation

Questions	Responses		
	Minimal	Average	Excellent
1. This workshop provided useful information in understanding the role of the state board member.	1	17	16
2. The address concerning the role of the state board member was informative and of assistance in understanding the responsibility in decision making.		21	15
3. The tips given for new board members in the afternoon address were valuable in anticipating situations which a new board member will encounter.	2	19	14
4. The morning and afternoon sessions provided a worthwhile opportunity for group discussion in which individual board members could ask and resolve questions concerning board membership.		9	24
5. The time provided for the day's activities was well planned and used adequately for the intended purpose.	1	8	26
6. The facilities for the day's workshop were comfortable and adequate.	1	9	21
7. The range of issues, situations and problems handed to you adequately portrayed real problems faced by state board members.		9	23

8. Could the afternoon session have been more productive? If so, how?

   a. Some guidance from people in business--allow for different board procedures in how they look at questions.

   b. Yes. Drastically reduce the number of questions and possible variables. Confine the questions to the ones most popular this year. I have participated in a number of these and I think the best was where the chair assigned the topic. Each participant was permitted to talk while the recorder wrote down the jist of his views. The whole period was timed. At the conclusion each recorder made a short (4-5) minute report of what the views were to the recalled or resumed full meeting.

c. The work atmosphere in the ballroom was not conducive to discussion because of the sound.

d. This was probably the most productive part.

e. Very good - six such comments.

f. Should have allowed more time for afternoon session.

g. Not sure, but moderator did not lead toward either consensus or summation. Discussion, therefore, lacked direction.

h. Fewer subjects--discussed in more depth.

i. I appreciated the opportunity to get down to grass roots discussion of individual state concerns.

j. Only additional time.

k. I think it was good--out group was a little small.

9. Would you offer suggestions for future conferences of this nature?

a. Maybe some better way to communicate between chief state school officers and NASBE.

b. A process of continual training for board members would be helpful. More indepth discussion and training than 1 day will allow.

c. I feel it should not be limited to new members. All members need re-education during their tenure.

d. Period for questioning speakers was too short. However, if the question period is extended, you stand the risk of having insufficient questions from the audience.

e. More small group discussions. I believe nearly 1/2 of the workshop could have been focused on small group functions.

f. Very well structured. Good opportunity for personnel exchange of ideas.

g. Perhaps at a new member (board) workshop, a veteran board member could have sat in on the group discussions and suggested ideas gleaned from his own personal experiences as a board member.

h. Material like Mr. McBride's address should be mailed in advance for study before the mini-conference.

i. Somehow directing discussion toward strategy and effectiveness and steering away from individual parochial concerns.

j. How about an information clinic in which board members could consult experts in areas?

k. Let the group set up priority questions to discuss.

l. More substantive issues rather than all procedural.

m. Please don't schedule tours during the same time as the session.

10. Overall Workshop Evaluation

Mediocre		Good		Superb
		11	21	3

Appendix B

Convention Evaluation

I. Rating of most interesting speakers by rank order

1. Flannery
2. Bell
3. Chisholm
4. Peyser
5. Mazzoni
6. Bittenbender
7. Selden

II. Rank order of most effective sessions

tie 1. Challenges to State Boards: The Impact of Recent Court Decisions (Flannery)

tie 2. State Boards Examined and Found Wanting (Mazzoni)

3. A Dialogue on Three Major Issues (Lierheimer, Selden, Salmon, Bittenbender)

4. The Challenges of Educational Leadership: State Boards and Results Oriented Management (Bell)

5. Sex Bias Legislation in Education, The Future of Federal Support for Education, and Influencing Educational Legislation in Congress (Chisholm and Peyser)

III. Overall Convention Rating

Mediocre		Good		Superb
		13	29	7

IV. Suggestions for Future Conventions

1. "More small groups discussions." (17 people agreed)

2. "More reactor type sessions with truly representative reactors."

3. "More time for questions and answers."

4. "Alternative schools as a topic."

5. "Continue to secure such top-notch leaders and speakers as were in evidence."

6. "Conference couldn't have been better, continue the same format," (5 people agreed).

7. "Many people in conversation have wondered how effectively any good gained at conferences has of sifting down to the kids."

8. "Discuss the idea "can state boards influence the quality of local boards?"

9. "Present two or more sides on controversial issues." (2 people agreed).

10. "Use more visual aids."

11. "Leave more exciting program for last day of conference if better attendance is expected."

12. "Provide adequate floor microphones so that floor speakers can be heard." (4 people agreed).

13. "Topic: (1) Review all Federal legislation, and (2) Concern of effect of "outside" forces on appointments and election of State Board Meetings."

14. "Have superb hosts like the New York Board of Regents."

15. "Maybe have small group breakfast groups to talk at random about what is going on in each state."

16. "Plan several sessions at one time by issue so that there would be some choice."

17. "Have discussions on integration and full state funding."

18. "Send agenda out in advance."

19. "More workshops."

20. "Not so many speakers from the federal level."

V. Some Quotes from Convention Evaluations

1. "I would like to spend more time to discuss various problems concerning different state board members suggestions to educate outsiders from far away places."

2. "I feel the workshops have been a great experience as always. I look forward to next year."

3. "No questions about banquet speakers? Does this reflect the fact that at a dinner like this the audience doesn't really want a speaker to say anything? So why have a serious one?"

4. "Speakers challenging with relevant topics. However, I got a little tired of hearing NASBE leaders tell us how great we are. We shouldn't have to be constantly patting ourselves on the back."

5. "Very warm thanks to the New York Regents for hosting us in splendid style." (10 people agreed).

6. "Member participation was lacking for the most part especially in light of the enthusiasm and desire to share and be shared with."

7. "Well-organized-good spirit." (7 people agreed).

8. "Many people commented that convention was stimulating and produced many challenges to NASBE organization."

9. "Get off the women's lib bit."

10. "A new high in workshops." (2 people agreed).

11. "Need to work toward more performance related performance."

12. "Good to have seen a teacher leader on the program. This is a rare happening."

13. "Exceptionally well-organized and well run. Some topics treated too superficially and failed to focus on the roles, responsibilities etc. of State Board Members."

14. "What effect on youth?"

15. "Less lecture more participation "

16. "Didn't feel adequately prepared to participate in convention."

17. "Choir was superb." (3 people agreed).

18. "Condense time in days to enable greater participation. Everything was expensive."

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
2480 West 26th Avenue, Suite 215-B
Denver, Colorado 80211

MINUTES

Annual Business Meeting
October 9, 1974
New York Hilton Hotel
New York, N.Y.

The Annual Business Meeting of the National Association of State Boards of Education was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by President Richard L. Bye. A roll call made of all the voting delegates by Cynthia Cunningham, the Credentials Committee Chairman, showed 42 states and territories present and 13 absent at the meeting.

Proposed Budget 1974-75

Esther R. Landa, the Secretary-Treasurer read the financial report and the projected budget for 1974-75.

William P. Bittenbender of New Hampshire moved, seconded by Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr. of New York the acceptance of the proposed budget for 1974-75. Motion carried.

By-Laws Committee Report

Robert H. McBride explained the proposed change in the by-laws. William P. Bittenbender of New Hampshire moved, seconded by Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr. of New York that the by-laws be amended. Passed 23 to 20. Motion carried.

Edward S. Bopp of Louisiana moved, seconded by William Kemp of Texas that the 1975 annual convention be held in New Orleans, Louisiana. Motion carried.

Resolutions Committee Report

James M. Connor, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, read the resolutions (appended along with supplementary report).

74-1-A. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. The motion carried.

74-1-B. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by William P. Bittenbender, so as to read: "The legally constituted state education agency should receive, administer, and be held accountable for general federal education revenue sharing funds with responsibility for specific expenditures determined by local school districts where needs are best evaluated." The amendment passed.

74-1-C. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplenentary report, seconded by Edward S. Bopp, so as to read, "Federal revenue sharing funds must be distributed on an equitable basis, considering state and local financial resources, need, and effort." The motion was carried.

74-1-D. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. The motion was carried.

74-1-E. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. The motion was carried.

74-1-F. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion was carried.

74-1-G. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion was carried.

74-1-H. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion was carried.

74-1-I. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion was carried.

Pat Hunt moved, seconded by William P. Bittenbender that the minutes should not use the word "unanimously" in recording the action on resolutions, since some delegates have been instructed by their states to abstain from voting.

74-1-J. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., so as to read: "Adequate funding should be assured for the National Institute of Education and the National Assessment of Educational Progress."

74-1-K. James M. Connor moved acceptance of a new resolution, seconded by Dorothy Ballard, so as to read, "Federal laws and guidelines for impact aid funds should grant states authority to consider the full amount of P.L. 874 funds in the determination of local resource funds for those states which have a state equalization finance formula." Motion was carried with New York abstaining.

74-2-A. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-2-B. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-2-C. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Emlyn I. Griffith. Motion carried.

74-2-D. Dorothea Chelgren moved a new amendment, seconded by Carl H. Pforzheimer, so as to read: "Equal opportunity for quality education should be the goal of desegregation/integration programs; transportation of pupils should be considered as one of the tools in achieving this goal." Motion was carried.

74-2-E. Steve Garrett moved a new amendment, seconded by William P. Bittenbender, so as to read: "While recognizing that fiscal responsibility is essential, NASBE requests that the number and complexity of reports to federal agencies be reduced and simplified to ensure that the highest possible proportion of money is spent for direct educational services." Motion was defeated.

James M. Connor moved acceptance of the entire section of 74-2, seconded by Patrick N. Williams. Motion carried.

74-3-A. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Edward S. Bopp, so as to read: "State boards of education, in conjunction with state agencies constitutionally empowered, should assume leadership roles in revising educational funding systems to provide an equal educational opportunity for each child, regardless of residence." The motion was carried.

74-3-B. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion was carried.

74-3-C. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Edward S. Bopp, so as to read: "Program and fiscal support should be provided by the states to school districts containing a high concentration of children with problems such as health, cultural deprivation, and family support when these problems affect low academic achievement."

Dorothea Chelgren moved an amendment, seconded by William P. Bittenbender to change the words of the supplementary report so as to read, " Program and fiscal support should be provided by the states to school districts containing a high concentration of children with problems when these problems affect low academic achievement." The motion to amend was defeated.

Calvin J. Hurd moved an amendment, seconded by Esther R. Landa to substitute for the language of "academic achievement" the phrase "educational objectives", so as to read, "Program and fiscal support should be provided by the states to school districts containing a high concentration of children with problems such as health, cultural differences, and family support when these problems affect achievement of educational objectives." The motion to amend is carried.

74-3-D. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-3-E. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp.

James M. Connor moved acceptance of the entire section of 74-3, seconded by Patrick N. Williams. Motion carried by majority vote.

74-4-A. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-4-B. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-4-C. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Patrick N. Williams, so as to read: "Equal opportunity for employment and advancement in state and local agencies should be assured to qualified persons without regard to sex, race, national origin, religious or political affiliation." Motion carried.

74-4-D. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Edward S. Bopp, so as to read, "State and local boards should provide appropriate channels for student participation in decision-making." Motion carried.

James M. Connor moved the adoption of the entire section of 74-4, seconded by William P. Bittenbender. Motion carried.

74-5-A. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr. Motion passed by a 23 to 8.

74-5-B. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion was carried.

74-5-C. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Edward S. Bopp, so as to read, "State Boards should continually review professional certification requirements and make changes as indicated with competency-based certification as one of the goals." Motion carried.

74-5-D. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Edward S. Bopp, so as to read, "Because tenure and continuing contract laws tend to stress job security at the expense of quality education, state and local boards should review such laws and consider reform, while safeguarding fair dismissal procedures for teachers and administrators." Motion carried.

74-5-E. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion was carried.

74-5-F. William P. Bittenbender moved a proposed resolution, seconded by Patrick N. Williams, so as to read, "State boards of education should study the question of collective bargaining statutes or regulations as may be appropriate for their individual state." Motion carried.

James M. Connor moved the adoption of the entire 74-5, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

James M. Connor moved, seconded by Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr. to adopt the preamble.

74-6-A. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-6-B. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-6-C. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-6-D. James M. Connor moved the adoption of the new resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp, so as to read: "Appropriate programs should be initiated or expanded to meet the needs of all handicapped children." Motion carried.

James M. Connor moved the change of all letters after d, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-6-E. James M. Connor moved the adoption of the resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr. so as to read: "Career Education, as an integral part of the educational program, should develop respect for work, workers and employers, motivation to learn by emphasizing the satisfaction in useful and stimulating careers, and awareness of alternative careers." Motion carried.

74-6-F. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-6-G. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Catherine V.A. Smith, so as to read, "An understanding of economic principles is essential for every citizen; its correlate, consumer education is necessary for all students in order to prepare them to be intelligent in the use of goods and services and in personal financial management." Motion to amend is carried. Motion is adopted.

74-6-H. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-6-I. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-6-J. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Edward S. Bopp, so as to read, "Early childhood education should

start as early in life as proven desirable by research and experience, especially for children with special needs. It should be family-based where possible." Motion carried.

74-6-K. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Richard L. Hilborn, so as to read, "Environmental education should emphasize the need to avoid misuse of natural resources and preserve the natural quality of life but should be balanced by recognition of mankind's need or natural resources, energy, food, goods, and services." Motion carried.

74-6-L. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-6-M. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Edward S. Bopp, so as to read, "Both comprehensive health services and health education for all students must stress causes, prevention and cures of major national problem areas such as alcohol and drug abuse and venereal disease." Motion carried.

74-6-N. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by William P. Bittenbender. Motion carried.

74-6-O. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-6-P. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-6-Q. A new resolution was proposed by Catherine V.A. Smith to be added as 74-6-Q, seconded by Edward S. Bopp, so as to read, "Educational materials and programs should be free of bias for or against persons on the basis of race, sex, national origin, or religion."

James M. Connor moved the adoption of the entire resolution 74-6, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-7-A. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-7-B. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

74-7-C. James M. Connor moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

A motion by Genevieve Klein of New York to strike all of 74-7 was lost.

James M. Connor moved the adoption of the entire 74-7, seconded by Edward S. Bopp. Motion carried.

Courtesy Resolution. A courtesy resolution (appended) was read by James M. Connor. Resolution passed by acclamation.

Report of Nominating Committee. Virla R. Krotz, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, read the slate of nominated officers. She moved acceptance of the report, seconded by M. R. R. Manz of North Carolina and asked that the Secretary-Treasurer cast a unanimous ballot for the slate and that the new officers be declared elected. The motion carried.

Richard L. Bye thanked the Area Vice-Presidents and the directors-at-large of NASBE for the wonderful work they did during 1973-74. He also thanked all the members of the various committees for all the work done during the same year.

COURTESY RESOLUTION

Adopted at the 1974 Annual Business Meeting
of the National Association of State Boards of Education
New York City, October 9, 1974

WHEREAS, the Regents of the State of New York have set the stage for this NASBE convention, and

WHEREAS, they have provided a backdrop of superb autumn weather and the exciting City of New York, and

WHEREAS, they have directed the production with grace and skill, and

WHEREAS, they have produced it with warmth and generosity,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the members of NASBE declare this a hit production and applaud its director and producers with a standing ovation.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
Proposed Budget
November 1, 1974 - October 31, 1975

ESTIMATED INCOME

Dues outstanding	$ 100,000	
Estimated Interest Income	2,500	
Total estimated income		$ 102,500

EXPENDITURES

Headquarters Staff:		
Executive Secretary Salary	$ 24,000	
Administrative Assistant Salary	8,000	
Temporary & part-time help	1,000	
Employee Benefits (1)	8,800	
1/2 time person for publications and arrangements	4,000	
Headquarters Maintenance:		
Office Rent	5,000	
Office Expense (2)		
a. Services & Expendables	4,600	
b. Capital expenditures	800	
c. Postage	2,000	
d. Reproduction	2,000	
Audit	500	
Bond insurance	300	
Travel:		
Officers, Board, Staff, Committees	21,000	
Publications:		
FOCUS and Interim Newsletters	5,000	
Augmented services to members (Research for states, backup materials for hearings and legislation, visits to State Boards on requests, etc.)	7,000	
Meetings:		
Annual Convention	3,400	
In-service Conferences and meetings	4,000	
Contingency Reserve (3)	1,100	
Total expenditures		$ 102,500

NOTE: (1) Includes Social Security Tax
(2) Includes maintenance and repair of equipment
(3) Does not include past savings

Estimated income from grants, donations, publication sales

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
2480 West 26th Avenue, Suite 215-B
Denver, Colorado 80211

FINANCIAL REPORT - BUDGET YEAR 1973-74

November 1, 1973 to September 30, 1974

	Budget	Collected
Dues	$ 77,850.00	$ 76,900.00
Interest and Other Income	2,000.00	4,044.74
	$ 79,850.00	$ 80,944.74

EXPENSES

	Expended	Balance	Budget
Executive Secretary	$ 24,900.00	$ 300.00	$ 25,200.00
Clerical Salary	6,875.00	625.00	7,500.00
Employee Benefits	3,446.18	1,653.82	5,100.00
Office Rent	3,794.23	405.77	4,200.00
Office Expense	9,710.69	(1,510.69)	8,200.00
Travel	21,709.68	(4,709.68)	17,000.00
Publications	4,531.30	(131.30)	4,400.00
Annual Convention	-0-	2,500.00	2,500.00
Area Conferences (including unbudgeted income)	5,812.21	(1,812.21)	4,000.00
Audit	450.00	-0-	450.00
Bond insurance	-0-	275.00	275.00
Contingency Reserve	-0-	1,025.00	1,025.00
	$ 81,229.29	$ (1,379.29)	$ 79,850.00